

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are currently pending in the present application, and all of the pending claims were rejected in a non-Final Office Action mailed on July 17, 2006. Independent Claims 1, 11, 17, 27, and 34 have been amended in the instant response. However, no new matter has been added by these amendments to the pending claims.

In Person Interview

On October 20th, 2006, an in person interview was conducted at the office of Examiner Cam Y. T. Truong by applicant's attorney, John W. Branch. At the interview, applicants' attorney explained the invention and discussed amending pending independent Claim 1 to include a data log and fundamental clause limitations in such a way that the Examiner agreed that the existing prior art references would no longer anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. However, the Examiner indicated that she would perform a new search in view of the proposed amendment before granting an allowance.

Moreover, as listed herein, all of the independent claims have now been amended in the manner discussed with the Examiner on October 20th, 2006; and as a result all of the pending independent and dependent claims are no longer anticipate or made obvious by the cited references.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to Claim 34 because of the following informalities: the phrase "the least one webpage" should be written as "the at least one webpage" in claim 34, lines 8-9.

In response, Claim 34 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Thus, amended Claim 34 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-13, 15-24, 26-28, 30-34 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick, U.S. Patent No. 5,913,214, in view of Iizuka et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,424,980.

As amended, Claim 1 provides for enabling a database-structured query with at least one fundamental clause to be generated by a user; and providing extracted data in a data log directly to the user. Both of these limitations are discussed and supported in the Specification, and represent further clarifications of the claimed invention, not new matter. Furthermore, in a meeting with the Examiner, it was agreed that none of the cited references taught either singly or in combination, either of these two limitations. Thus, amended Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Additionally, independent Claims 11, 17, 27, and 34, are somewhat similar to independent Claim 1, albeit different, and each of these independent claims have been amended in a manner substantially similar to amended Claim 1. Therefore, amended independent Claims 11, 17, 27, and 34, are now in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18-24, 26, 28, 30-33, 37, and 38 are also non-obvious for at least the same reasons as the respective amended independent claims upon which they depend.

Also, Claims 4, 14, 25, 29, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. in view of Hennings et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,763,496. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. in view of Jammes, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,149. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. in view of Jammes and Christianson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,085,186.

However, dependent Claims 4, 7-9, 14, 25, 29, 35, and 36 are at least allowable for substantially the same reasons as the respective amended independent claims upon which they depend.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments, Applicants believe that the pending application is in condition for allowance. If any further questions remain, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Dated: November 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8906 • (212) 527-7701 fax
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant